

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the rejection of the claims as unpatentable over TEIBEL et al. 6,363,427 in view of BURNS et al. 6,275,496.

Even if combined as proposed, TEIBEL and BURNS do not disclose or suggest various of the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 15.

TEIBEL describes a BBS system in which there is no central server, but the messages are stored on various servers 170, 190. To do this, the addresses 145, 155 of the participating servers are filed on storage means 160, 180, which can be accessed by the client computers 105, 110. The clients 105, 110 can learn the server IDs 145, 155 via the network 140 and from servers 170, 190 can retrieve lists of the messages stored there, including the message IDs 135, 150 which identify the messages. A list of messages can be prepared therefrom.

With reference to claim 1, TEIBEL however does not disclose that the service provider (here "first server" 170 or "second server" 190) allocates the Ident Code ("message ID") itself which identifies the information ("message") to the information provider. The "message ID" 150 is assigned by the client 105 (therefore, the information provider) himself to the message 130. See column 3, lines 54-57 of TEIBEL, in which it is recited that the client 105 stores a message 180 and a message ID 150 on the server 170. As an example for the message ID, TEIBEL

suggests the URLS (column 4, line 1). In this case, it is apparent that only the client 105 establishes the message 130 and the message ID 150, since by storing the message 130 only the message ID is formed with the type of storage selected by the client 105. Accordingly, it cannot be a matter of allocating the identcodes by the service provider. Step "a" is thus not disclosed by TEIBEL.

Furthermore, as the Examiner points out, step c) is not disclosed, according to which it is checked whether the identcode was transmitted to the service provider by the information provider within a certain time interval, whereupon the information is erased by the service provider when the identcode has not been sent, or the certain time interval restarts when the identcode has been transmitted by the information provider to the service provider, whereupon step c) is repeated. TEIBEL discloses only that the messages can be erased from the BBS when they are no longer relevant or up-to-date.

For the features of step c), the Official Action relies on BURNS. BURNS discloses a system with a content server on which, for example, data files are filed which are to be accessed by subscribers by means of a server. To do this, conventionally the subscriber must send an inquiry to the server, whereupon the latter sends an inquiry to the content server which makes available to the server the corresponding file, whereupon it can be downloaded. Conversely, BURNS suggests having continuously

available selected information or files in the form of a cache on the server itself according to certain selection processes, where they have been transmitted for example during an off-peak time.

In the context of this cache system, the TTL ("time-to-live") tags disclosed in column 10, line 59 to column 11, line 19 can also be read. In a cache server, the currentness of the information is essential. Accordingly, the TTL tags are the time up to which the corresponding information is updated again, compare for example the first alternative, in which the server attaches an "expiration tag" which reproduces the assessment of the information provider as to when the contents are refreshed, compare column 10, lines 63-65.

In the other alternative, it is also simply a matter of currentness, compare column 10, line 66 to column 11, line 14. Accordingly, the computation of the TTL tag is done based on the theory that older contents are changed less frequently. The basis for this is the instant at which the contents (on the content server) were last updated. In turn, it is therefore ultimately a matter of assessing how long the cached file corresponds to the version on the content server.

In column 11, lines 15-19 of BURNS, erasures are mentioned, in any case the determination of the erasure instant is not detailed at all. It is simply disclosed that the erasure instants are a function of the contents themselves, the inquiry of

the subscribers, the costs for more recent, more up-to-date contents, and the limitation due to the memory.

But this does not describe the procedure of step c) of claim 1. First of all, it is not disclosed that the identcode is sent again by the information provider. On the one hand, an identcode is not mentioned in BURNS, on the other hand other data transmission with reference to erasing the contents of the information server is not disclosed. Only the inquiry of subscribers is described. But in principle, this corresponds to the opposite of what the present invention seeks to achieve. Here, it is a matter of the information provider himself being able to determine how long his information is at the service provider. This is completely independent of the inquiry for this information. In BURNS, however, the inquiring parties determine the time interval for which the information is available - as also makes sense in a cache system, in which it is also especially a matter of audio and video files, compare column 4, line 31. Furthermore, BURNS does not disclose a specific relationship between the "time-to-live" and the final erasure of the information. This follows unequivocally from column 11, lines 8-14, according to which, when the contents have not been updated within the TTL, simply a new, narrower TTL is given. The TTL therefore also ultimately determines how often the cache server is updated with reference to this file. The TTL can apparently be brought into a relationship with the final erasure of the

contents, but it is not disclosed how this should take place. Therefore, that within a certain time interval an identcode which is not disclosed by BURNS is transmitted again by the information provider, and depending on which it is decided whether the information is erased or the certain time interval is beginning again, is neither disclosed nor in any way suggested by BURNS.

From the above, it will be seen that neither step a) nor step c) is disclosed or even suggested by TEIBEL or by BURNS, no matter how combined. This is true of claim 1, and also of claims 11 and 15. As the other claims in the case depend from the independent claims, it follows that the subject matter of none of the claims in the case is either taught or suggested by BURNS or by TEIBEL.

Accordingly, it is believed that the claims are patentable as they stand.

In view of the foregoing remarks, therefore, it is believed that this application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional
fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Robert J. Patch, Reg. No. 17,355
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

RJP/lk